

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/361,652

Applicant(s)
C.S. Zuker et al.

Examiner
Michael Brannock, Ph.D.

Group Art Unit
1646



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael Brannock,

(3) Yvonne Eyler

(2) Annette Parent

(4) _____

Date of Interview Aug 2, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) N/A

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed utility rejection: examiner maintained that the specification provides only an invitation to perform research and investigation to determine what, particularly, the claimed polynucleotides might be useful for.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

MICHAEL BRANNOCK, PH.D.
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1646